

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to an Office Action mailed on February 27, 2003. Claims 1-20 are rejected. Claim 7 has been amended to spell out the word OLED (Organic Light Emitting Diode). The Specification has been amended in the Brief Description of Drawings section to clarify what **Figure 6E** describes. The support for the description for **Figure 6E** can be found, for example, at page 10 paragraph [0051] of the Specification. No new matter has been added.

First, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 11, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,545,291, hereinafter “Smith”), in view of Suto, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,746,787, hereinafter “Suto”).

The Examiner stated that Smith teaches a first substrate 10 coupled to a second substrate 17 and the first substrate 10 comprising a plurality of display/driver/integrated circuit blocks 19 which are deposited onto the first substrate (Figure 1-3 and 7 of the Smith reference. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In Smith, only the first substrate 10 is a substrate. The layer 17 is a gallium arsenide layer 17 that is formed over the first substrate 10. The layer 17 is a material from which the gallium arsenide blocks 19 are formed. As illustrated in Figures 1-3 and column 5 of the Smith patent, after the layer 17 is formed on the substrate 10, masking and etchings steps are performed. “Generally, unexposed portions of gallium arsenide 17 are etched up to sacrificial layer 13 as illustrated in FIG 2. Such etching step provides a plurality of shaped gallium arsenide blocks 19.” After the blocks 19 are formed (after masking and etching), the gallium arsenide layer 17 is no longer on the substrate 10. (Smith, col. 5, lines 45-58). After the blocks 19 are formed on the first substrate 10, they

are removed by a lift-off technique and removed from the substrate 10. (Smith, col. 6, lines 15-35 and Figure 3). The blocks 19 are dispensed in a solution and are then deposited onto a substrate 50 into regions 55. (Smith, col. 7, lines 29-49, and Figure 6). The gallium arsenide layer 17 is thus not coupled to the first substrate 10 that comprises any blocks 19. When the gallium arsenide layer 17 is formed on the substrate 10, there is no block 19 yet to be formed. The gallium arsenide layer 17 is the material that the blocks 19 are formed of and is thus not a second substrate that is coupled to the first substrate 10 that comprises the blocks 19.

Thus, Smith did not teach, suggest, or motivate a first substrate coupling to a second substrate wherein the first substrate comprising a plurality of display blocks which are deposited onto said first substrate and an integrated circuit coupled to the display blocks... as claimed by claims 1, 11, 19, and 20.

Therefore, Smith, alone, or in combination with Suto cannot teach a first substrate coupling to a second substrate wherein the first substrate comprising a plurality of display blocks which are deposited onto said first substrate and an integrated circuit coupled to the display blocks as claimed by claims 1, 11, 19, and 20.

Second, the Examiner rejected claims 2-10, and 12-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith, as modified by Suto as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Jacobsen, et al, (U.S. Patent No. 6,281,038, hereinafter "Jacobsen").

As discussed above, Smith did not teach, suggest, or motivate a first substrate coupling to a second substrate wherein the first substrate comprising a plurality of display blocks which are deposited onto said first substrate and an integrated circuit coupled to the display blocks... as claimed by claims 2-10 and 12-18.

Therefore, Smith, alone, or in combination with Suto and/or Jacobsen cannot

teach a first substrate coupling to a second substrate wherein the first substrate comprising a plurality of display blocks which are deposited onto said first substrate and an integrated circuit coupled to the display blocks as claimed by claims 2-10 and 12-18.

Third, the Examiner rejected claims 2-4, 7-8, 10, 12, 14, and 18 as being obvious over Smith and Jacobsen.

As discussed above, Smith did not teach, suggest, or motivate a first substrate coupling to a second substrate wherein the first substrate comprising a plurality of display blocks which are deposited onto said first substrate and an integrated circuit coupled to the display blocks... as claimed by claims 2-4, 7-8, 10, 12, 14, and 18. Even if Jacobson teaches a flexible substrate applicable for fabricating a display thereon, Jacobson did not teach, suggest, or motivate a first substrate coupling to a second substrate wherein the first substrate comprising a plurality of display blocks which are deposited onto said first substrate and an integrated circuit coupled to each of the display blocks. Jacobson cannot be combined with Smith and/or Suto to derive to the elements claimed in claims 2-4, 7-8, 10, 12, 14, and 18.

Therefore, Smith, alone, or in combination with Jacobsen cannot teach a first substrate coupling to a second substrate wherein the first substrate comprising a plurality of display blocks which are deposited onto said first substrate and an integrated circuit coupled to the display blocks as claimed by claims 2-4, 7-8, 10, 12, 14, and 18.

Fourth, the Examiner rejected claims 5-6, 9, and 13 as being obvious over Smith and Jacobsen. The Examiner stated that Jacobsen teaches a display generation substrate coupled to an active matrix.

As discussed above, Smith did not teach, suggest, or motivate a first substrate coupling to a second substrate wherein the first substrate comprising a plurality of display

blocks which are deposited onto said first substrate and an integrated circuit coupled to the display blocks... as claimed by claims 5-6, 9, and 13 as being obvious over Smith and Jacobsen. Even if Jacobson teaches an active matrix, Jacobson did not teach, suggest, or motivate a first substrate coupling to a second substrate wherein the first substrate comprising a plurality of display blocks which are deposited onto said first substrate and an integrated circuit coupled to each of the display blocks. Jacobson cannot be combined with Smith to derive to the elements claimed in claims 5-6, 9, and 13.

Therefore, Smith, alone, or in combination with Jacobsen cannot teach a first substrate coupling to a second substrate wherein the first substrate comprising a plurality of display blocks which are deposited onto said first substrate and an integrated circuit coupled to the display blocks as claimed by claims 5-6, 9, and 13 as being obvious over Smith and Jacobsen. The Examiner stated that Jacobsen teaches.

As discussed above, the pending claims are patentable over the above references.

Deposit Account Authorization


Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Mimi Diemmy Dao at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR
& ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: May 27, 2003


Mimi Diemmy Dao
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,628

Customer No. 008791
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300